

Remarks

The specification has been amended to better conform to 37 C.F.R. § 1.77 and to more clearly delineate between the background art and the applicant's advancements. Some minor typographical errors have also been corrected.

In the claims, claim 1 has been amended, and new claims 2-17 have been added. New claims 2-10 depend from independent system claim 1. New claim 11 is an independent method claim, from which new claims 12-17 depend.

Support for the amendments to claim 1 and for the new claim 11 can be found, *inter alia*, in the specification passages at page 7, lines 20-24; page 10, lines 1-4; and page 10, lines 15-16. Support for the new dependent claims can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,923,276, issued to Wells. Wells discloses an optical fiber telescope formed from cascaded sections of tapered optical fibers. Multiple such telescopes can be arrayed in a square grid, such as illustrated in Wells's Figures 4 and 5, with each telescope pointed in a slightly different direction. The pointing direction of each telescope can be varied, so as to cause the array to scan a portion of the sky. When the array scans a portion of the sky in which a detectable object is located, the telescopes in the array produce pulses, as shown in Figure 6, which can be analyzed to track the position and the velocity of the object. Wells also discloses a system of two arrays, as shown in Figure 7, that can generate an image of the object being tracked.

Wells fails to disclose the applicant's invention as set forth in the independent amended claim 1 and new claim 11. Neither the array of telescopes shown in Wells's Figures 4 and 5, nor the system of arrays shown in Wells's Figure 7, teaches or suggests the subject matter of those claims.

Both claims 1 and 11 refer to "high resolution optical imaging" and connections to a "system capable of generating images." Wells's array of telescopes and associated sensors, as shown in Figures 4 and 5, are incapable of generating images. They are

capable only of tracking an object's position in the sky. Wells's only disclosure of a system capable of imaging is the system of two arrays, illustrated in Figure 7.

However, Wells's two-array imaging system illustrated in Figure 7 does not teach or suggest other limitations in the independent claims. In particular, both claims 1 and 11 also refer to "more than two sensors spaced arbitrarily with respect to each other." While Wells does suggest that more than two arrays can be utilized together in an imaging system (see col. 11, lines 18–20), as shown in Figure 7, Wells does not disclose how more than two arrays might be "spaced arbitrarily with respect to each other." In fact, Wells teaches nothing about the relative spacing between his arrays except that the distance between the two illustrated arrays must be sufficient to enable imaging. See col. 11, lines 24–26. The applicant accordingly submits that claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Wells.

The dependent claims 2–10 and 12–17 are also patentable over Wells by virtue of their dependency from patentable claims 1 or 11.

For at least the reasons presented above, the applicant submits that the application is an condition for allowance and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowability. If the Examiner has any concerns about the application, or if the undersigned attorney can assist in expediting the examination of the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "MCPH", followed by a horizontal line.

Matthew C. Phillips
Registration No. 43,403

STOEL RIVES LLP
900 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2600
Portland, OR 97204-1268
Telephone: (503) 224-3380
Facsimile: (503) 220-2480
Attorney Docket No. 27393/11:1